

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

JOSEPH ADAMS, JR.,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 21-12472

HON. DENISE PAGE HOOD

v.

UAW INTERNATIONAL UNION and  
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO ALTER OR AMEND JUDGMENT  
OR FOR RECONSIDERATION (ECF No. #14)**

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Joseph Adams, Jr.'s Motion To Alter or Amend Judgment, or Alternatively Motion for Reconsideration filed on August 12, 2024. (ECF No. 14) On July 16, 2024, the Court entered an Order and Judgment dismissing Plaintiff's case. (ECF Nos. 12, 13)

An amendment of an order after a judgment has been entered is governed by Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Rule 59(e) provides that any motion to alter or amend a judgment must be filed no later than 28 days after entry of the judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). Motions to alter or amend judgment may be granted if there is a clear error of law, newly discovered evidence, an intervening change in controlling law or to prevent manifest injustice. *GenCorp., Inc. v. American Int'l Underwriters*, 178 F.3d 804, 834 (6th Cir. 1999). A motion for

reconsideration is not a vehicle to re-hash old arguments, or to proffer new arguments or evidence that the movant could have brought up earlier. *Sault Ste. Marie Tribe v. Engler*, 146 F.3d 367, 374 (6th Cir. 1998)(motions under Fed.R.Civ.P. 59(e) “are aimed at *re* consideration, not initial consideration”)(citing *FDIC v. World Universal Inc.*, 978 F.2d 10, 16 (1st Cir.1992)). Parties seeking reconsideration of final orders or judgments must file a motion under Rule 59(e) and not under the Local Rules. E.D. Mich. LR 7(h)(1).

After reviewing Plaintiff’s Motion, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s Motion merely presents the same issues ruled upon by the Court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The Court dismissed Plaintiff’s claims as barred by res judicata and as time-barred. (ECF No. 12) Plaintiff’s Motion has not shown that the Court committed a clear error of law nor a palpable defect. Plaintiff has not shown that altering the Order and Judgment would prevent manifest injustice. The Motion to Alter Judgment under Rule 59(e) and/or alternatively, Motion for Reconsideration under E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(h) are denied. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion To Alter Judgment or Amend Judgment, or Alternatively Motion for Reconsideration (**ECF No. 14**) are DENIED.

s/Denise Page Hood  
DENISE PAGE HOOD  
United States District Judge

DATED: March 31, 2025